

**10/630,167**  
**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 have been rejected as unpatentable over Bradley in view of Hakalehto. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the attached amended claims and following considerations.

Applicant's claim 1 has been further amended to include a positive limitation to disposable tubing leading into and out of the culturing container. The principal reference Bradley makes no suggestion of a disposable combination or structure of container and tubing leading into and out of the container.

Claim 1 has also been amended to include a limitation to locating the filter remote from the container. In contrast, the Bradley filter is located within the Bradley container for the purpose of trapping liquid droplets and returning them to the liquid in the container. Applicant's filter is remote from the container and for the purpose of trapping both liquid and particulate matter to prevent contamination of the air pump. Thus, the combination of limitations set forth in claim 1 are not believed suggested by Bradley. Hakalehto adds nothing to further suggest the amended combination because the Hakalehto device does not draw air therethrough.

Claim 2 of applicant has been amended to include a linking tube leading to the filter. Since the filter in Bradley is inside the Bradley container, this limitation is not suggested. Nor is the linking tube suggested by Hakalehto.

Remaining dependent claims 3-10 all incorporate claim 1 by reference and therefore are believed allowable along with claims 1 and 2.

(S:\JMD\Eden, Gideon\Resp to Action 03-17-2005.doc)